

# VERIZON PUBLIC HEARING ON 9/22/21 AT 6PM

## Council Chambers

### Wireless Telecommunications facilities in non-preferred zones

#### SITE LOCATIONS:

1.	GLENDALÉ 004	Front of 302 N Louise St	EP-677
2.	GLENDALÉ 007	Front of 431 E. Chevy Chase Dr	EP-683
3.	GLENDALÉ 008	Front of 510 W. Milford Dr	EP-678
4.	GLENDALÉ 009	Adjacent to 346 N Adams St	EP-684
5.	GLENDALÉ 010	Across from 1121 E. Wilson Ave	EP-679
6.	GLENDALÉ 014	Front of 210 S. Brand Blvd	EP-685
7.	GLENDALÉ 017	1209 Concord St	EP-686
8.	GLENDALÉ 018	Front of 1219 N. Columbus Ave	EP-680
9.	GLENDALÉ 020	Front of 1339 Virginia Ave	EP-681
10.	GLENDALÉ 021	Front of 1432 Hillcrest Ave	EP-687
11.	GLENDALÉ 027	Front of 1400 Graynold Ave	EP-682
12.	GLENDALÉ 028	Front of 1361 Raymond Ave	EP-688

## Summary Minutes of the Speakers Comments

### The questions were answered by the applicant after public hearing.

1. Gary Tchakmakian – Resident – 431 E. Chevy Chase Drive

Sites: Glendale 007 – **Against**

- Very close to his property

*What is the liability of the homeowners when tenant moves because of the cell site being installed?*

Not answered.

- Not enough study to conclude 4G is safe and not harmful.

- Reports provided by applicant is not accurate especially alternative locations

*Why alternative site #2 that is in front of signal family residence does not work?*

Per applicant's alternative site analysis Alternate 2 would require a 5 ft taller pole to install new facilities creating a total structure height taller than the proposed location. Also, Alternate 2 is closer to residential buildings than the proposed location.

*How much of harm will the increase of the RF cause?*

The RF exposure limits were set by the FCC in 1996, at the direction of Congress, and were reaffirmed in 2019. All FCC-regulated small cells must comply with the FCC's RF limits. As such, ExteNet's installations adhere to those standards. The public limit incorporates a fifty times safety factor, that is, the limit is set fifty times below the level where the scientific consensus shows that there may be observable effects on humans. So, with the large safety factor in place, there are anticipated no observable effects at sites that are below the FCC limits. More information can be found at the FCC RF safety page (<https://www.fcc.gov/general/radio-frequency-safety-0>). In addition, many household items, including microwave ovens, wireless modems, and televisions emit RF emissions and are deemed safe for everyday consumer use by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

*Who will control the increase of RF?*

ExteNet installations are monitored by the ExteNet Network Operations Center (NOC). This is a 24/7, 365 days of the year, on-call program. The RF exposure limits were set by the FCC in 1996, at the direction of Congress, and were reaffirmed in 2019. The public limit incorporates a fifty times safety factor, that is, the limit is set fifty times below the level where the scientific consensus shows that there may be observable effects on humans. So, with the large safety factor in place, there are anticipated no observable effects at sites that are below the

FCC limits. More information can be found at the FCC RF safety page (<https://www.fcc.gov/general/radio-frequency-safety-0>). In addition, many household items, including microwave ovens, wireless modems, and televisions emit RF emissions and are deemed safe for everyday consumer use by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration

- Move the location to alternative #2

2. Lisa Tchakmakian – Resident – 431 E Chevy Chase Drive  
Sites: Glendale 007 – **Against**

*Who determines the site?*

Wireless connectivity is an essential service. Verizon contracts with ExteNet systems to ensure its coverage for its customers meets carrier requirements. Small cell operators like Verizon create RF models with their equipment to determine the distance where the small cell meets FCC guidelines. ExteNet models the small cells at full power to determine the outside limits of the FCC regulations.

*Who decides the alternative sites?*

Alternative sites are identified by a 3rd party vendor with over 40 years of experience in the telecom industry.

*Why are we not getting proper alternative sites?*

Standard industry practice is to identify, existing vertical infrastructure found within close proximity of the proposed site. ExteNet works with the pole owners to identify viable poles. Pole owners determine whether we can attach to poles with risers, transformers etc. For example, wood utility poles have a pole owner with various “tenants” utilizing the wood pole structure that include cable, utility and telecom companies. If the pole has no available space to attach or is identified as a deteriorating structure, it will be disqualified as a viable candidate

*Anything provided that proves the gap in coverage to the City?*

Propagation maps indicate the desired coverage by the carrier and the carrier may desire the site to densify an area of the network, fill a coverage gap, introduce a new service or improve capacity.

- Chose a location further from residents and big enough sidewalk to install the GWP Myer's pedestal.
- According to EME report the max. safe horizontal distance is 9 ft and our building is 15 ft.
- Electrical Engineering report provided is not stamped

3. Paul Kizirian – Resident – 1361 Raymond Ave

Site: Glendale 028 - **Against**

- Yes, the coverage needs improvement but 100ft. away from the provided location GWP has facility consider moving the location to corner of Bel Aire and Raymond Ave.
- The site has power already which will be cost saving to the provider

*Is moving 100ft. away from the proposed location will affect the gap coverage and signal?*

Based on many factors including existing topography, building structures, etc., the antenna performance (signal) may be affected. Small cells are limited to about three-quarters of mile range based upon these types of factors and therefore site selection impacts the entire network design.

*How much radiation do people actually experience standing next to the pole at 4-6 ft high?*

Answer provided during public hearing by applicant's expert (see rebuttal)

*Do you plan doing any actual testing at the site instead of predicting info base on the modeling provided on the plans?*

Predicted modeling is based on antenna model and the information provided by the manufacturer. ExteNet models each small cell site to ensure that it meets all FCC safety standards.

*How much radiation will the people be exposed to at 50-100 ft away from this specific site at antenna high?*

Answer provided during public hearing by applicant's expert (see rebuttal)

*Is this a 4G or 5G?*

Answer provided during public hearing by applicant (see rebuttal)

4. Garnik Sarkisian – Resident – 1400 Graynold Ave

Site: Glendale 027 – **Against**

- Per American Cancer Society further studies need to be done to determine that RF is not harm to humans.
- No connectivity issues at my house for Verizon carriers.
- This cell site is not needed in this area.

*What are the guarantees that this 4G site will not be updated to 5G and even 6G in the future?*

There have been no discussions, nor plans to upgrade these sites to 5G.

*Who controls that it will not be upgraded?*

Verizon makes the decisions on whether to upgrade or add to existing 4G sites to 5G. With regards to 5G technology, it is simply the latest evolution of wireless services, following the 4G and 3G (4th and 3rd Generation) service before it. The distinguishing feature of 5G is exponentially faster data speeds that enable new uses of wireless technologies, and improve access to social services, healthcare, education, transportation, energy, and employment. 5G has many benefits and chief among them is broadband speed rivaling and surpassing the current speeds of fixed broadband networks. Commercial-scale deployment of 5G is likely to

achieve speeds at upwards of ten times as fast as average 4G LTE speeds. The average user's 4G speed is generally 35 Mbps. Based on current understanding of 5G technology, the average user's speeds could vary from 50 Mbps to 3 Gbps.

- We don't want to change the character of this neighborhood

*What are the right of Glendale residents to stop this project moving forward?*

Appeal to City Council per GMC Uniform Appeal Procedure. Thereafter legal action as set forth per application state/federal statutes.

- Small cell sites should be focused on commercial and mountain areas not residential.

*Why is this project considered as federal project?*

Answer provided during public hearing by applicant (see rebuttal)

5. Polet Der Hovanessian – Resident – 1339 Virginia Ave

Site: Glendale 020 - **Against**

- Very close to the schools (Hoover, Keppel, Toll, Franklin and Edison).
- Children are exposed to radiation for hours while attending school.
- Radiation exposure to the families.
- Move to commercial areas not residential.
- There are flaws in the study, they are not conclusive.
- City of Glendale upper management are also responsible for this since they are selected official by Glendale residents.
- Property values are decreasing
- City needs to take actions against this project
- We need more evidence that you guys are going to protect our safety
- Verizon reception works just fine; this is absolute wrong info about the Verizon service.

6. Rola Masri – resident – not provided

Site: N/A - **Against**

- Research director of California Brain Tumor Association
- Recent petition and ruling against FCC regarding their safety standards for wireless admission (EA Trust vs. FCC)
- Asking City of Glendale to desist any approval of the small cell sites until this case has been resolved since FCC safety standards are not safe at this time
- Health issues

7. Julie Levine – All sites - (5G free CA)

Site: All Sites – **Against**

- Executive director of 5G free CA
- Environmental hazard
- Visit [www.5GfreeCA.com](http://www.5GfreeCA.com) to learn about harms of 4G & 5G

8. Anahit Dermeagerdichian – Resident – 1400 Graynold Ave

Site: Glendale 027 – **Against**

- Concerned about health issues.
- Very close to the schools (Hoover, Keppel, Toll, Franklin and Edison).
- It will affect the property's value.

*Who decided the location of the mayor's pedestal?*

Glendale Electrical Engineering section determines the location of the pedestal.

- City staff should care about the resident health.
- Petition is signed by 110 residents and submitted to city staff.

*What kinds of rights does the City of Glendale residents have?*

Appeal to City Council per GMC Uniform Appeal Procedure. Thereafter legal action as set forth per application state/federal statutes.

- Move the location of the GWP pedestal fronting my property.
- Show pictures of the pedestal in the notification

9. Ara Manoogian– All the sites - (5G free CA)

Site: All sites - **Against**

- August 13, 2021 US Court of District of Columbia case
- Concerned about environmental issues.
- Radiation is harmful to humans
- Put immediate stop to all small cell sites until FCC complies with court order
- The council members should take precautions for the safety of their own residents
- Asking for City of Glendale to provide prove that the proposed radiation is safe technology.
- Visit [www.5GfreeGlendale.com](http://www.5GfreeGlendale.com)

10. Victoria Valentine – resident – not provided

Site: N/A – **Against**

*Why City of Glendale?*

The deployment of small wireless facilities is in all cities, state wide and nationwide, not just Glendale. The city of Glendale is a progressive, 21st century cutting edge city and we want to assist in providing residents, businesses and visitors with wireless accessibility.

- Show on the City's website all small cell site locations (proposed and approved) by all carriers.

*How much money is the City getting from Verizon?*



Encroachment permit application fee and GWP pole space fee/energy fees as set forth per fee schedule and applicable permits and licenses.

- Do underground fiber instead of small cell site.

11. Karen Wadler – Resident – 1219 N. Columbus

Site: Glendale 018 – **Against**

- The radiation impacts the human health, damages DNA & creates tumor
- Not enough studies done by conclude 4G is safe
- Until FCC does recent study the sites shouldn't get approved

12. Abraham Chilingarian – Resident – 1361 Raymond

Site: Glendale 028 – **Against**

- On the notifications show the location of the pedestal
- Move the location to corner of Bel Air and Raymond
- Post the questions of the residents on website by providing answers

13. Carlene Weinberger – Resident – 210 S Brand Blvd

Site: Glendale 14 – **Against**

- No studies prove that 5G is safe.

*Who is profiting from all those encroachment sites?*

The City doesn't make a profit; it can recover some costs as allowed by statutes.

- The public hearing should be hold in public's presents with masks on
- Proposing more hearing for education and information

14. Leesa Puleo- Resident – 1400 Graynold Ave

Site: Glendale 27 – **Against**

- Radiation exposure to the families and animals taking a walk

- Health concerns
- Very close to the schools (Hoover, Keppel, Toll, Franklin and Edison).
- Move to different location
- Not matching to the neighborhood aesthetically

15. Sandra Applegate – Resident – 1339 Virginia Ave

Site: Glendale 20 – **Against**

- Very close to the schools (Hoover, Keppel, Toll, Franklin and Edison).
- Verizon failed to prove that radiation doesn't cause health issues to humans

16. Tony Passarella – Resident – 1209 Concord St

Site: Glendale 17 – **Against**

- The radiation cause cancer.
- This forum is not adequate enough to answer the residents' questions
- City of Glendale needs to do more outreach and community hearings
- Should have community meeting with Verizon representative

*How can we know if the radiation is not increased remotely?*

Answer provided during public hearing by applicant's expert (see rebuttal)

17. Jeff Yeager – Resident – 302 N Louise st

Site: Glendale 004 – **Against**

- The public hearing should be held with residents present at the hearing
- 5G being installed by Spectrum secretly from the public in Hollywood Hills.

18. Ginger Aghvinian – Resident – 431 E. Chevy Chase & 1339 Virginia Ave

Site: Glendale 007 & Glendale 020 – **Against**

- Very close to my children's bedroom window

- Very close to the schools (Hoover, Keppel, Toll, Franklin and Edison).
- Children expose to radiation for hours while attending school.
- Move it to commercial zones

## **REBUTTAL BY VERIZON REPRESENTATIVE AND BY EXPERT**

The expert and Verizon representatives answered resident's questions.

The expert is Raj Mathur with Hammett & Edison.

Raj – We evaluate RF exposure compliance with respect to the FCC standards. Extenet submitted RF report by licensed engineer from another firm which evaluated the RF conditions, exposure and standards. We have reviewed all of those reports and we agree with the findings that RF exposure levels at ground at any of the nearby homes will be less than the FCC public limit.

Raj and Verizon representatives answered some of the questions posed by participants in the hearing.

- At ground level the RF exposure level is well below the public limit.
- According to EME report submitted by ExteNet the maximum horizontal distance to the public limit is 9 ft. and the nearest building is 15 ft., which would be further than the distance to public limit.

## **QUESTIONS ANSWERED DURING PUBLIC HEARING**

*1. How much radiation do people actually experience standing next to the pole at 4-6 ft. high? How much radiation will the people be exposed to at 50-100 ft. away from this specific site at antenna high?*

RM: (This was a site specific question for Node 28, 1361 Raymond Avenue) The maximum RF exposure level for a person anywhere at ground, after taking ground

elevation increases into account, would be about 6% of the FCC public limit. This is about 15 times below the FCC limit. The further you move away from the antenna the RF exposure levels drops rapidly. They drop by square of the distance – it's called the inverse square law. So, if you go twice as far away from the antenna the exposure will drop by square of two, or four times, if you go ten times as far away from the antenna the exposure will drop by square of ten, or 100 times. The exposure level drops exponentially with distance.

Only Verizon is installing this equipment

## 2. Court ruling (EA Trust vs. FCC)

RM: The court takes no position on health related impacts, such as cancer, with regards to RF exposure. The court wants FCC to provide further information on studies related to non-cancer related. The cancer related studies were adequately reviewed by the FCC; the courts want further clarification on the non-cancer related studies.

## 3. *How can we know if the frequency is not increased remotely?*

RM: It can't. The frequency can't be changed. The equipment is designed to operate at 2 GHz. For change of frequency the antenna and equipment needs to be changed. The equipment is restricted to the frequency of operation.

## 4. *Why is this project considered as federal project?*

It is not a federal project. ExteNet Systems is a privately owned company pursuing these encroachment permits.

## 5. *Is this a 4G or 5G?*

It is 4G network.

## 6. *Multiple carriers installing small cell next pole to one another in one neighborhood what is the radiation level?*

RM: The radiation level and power level drops by the square of the distance. So, by the time the signal reaches the other pole the level drops significantly and is well below the FCC limit.

In addition, when actual measurements are taken with a broadband meter, the measurement covers the whole RF spectrum. The meter does not measure just Verizon or AT&T; it is measuring all the carriers combined. It gives a cumulative measure of the RF exposure levels.

*7. One carrier over the other on the same pole how does that affect the radiation level?*

RM: Typically, one pole is for one carrier. They will not be room on a pole for another equipment by different carrier.

*8. If it is Verizon only, then private entity can take over easements within private property then it is not public utility. I question the legality of that?*

Extenet Systems and Verizon are installing equipment in the public right of way. ExteNet is not seeking an entitlement or permit to place equipment on private property.